

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and it is respectfully submitted that the application, as amended, is patentable over the art of record. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haffenden et al., (U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,189) in view of Grandbert (WO 98/25424). Applicant notes that independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to add the limitation of original claim 4 to further distinguish the present invention over the prior art. Applicant further notes that claim 4 has been cancelled.

Haffenden does not teach or disclose the limitations of amended claims 1 and 11. More specifically, Haffenden does not teach or disclose “a housing-side stopper formed by a resilient piece having an end fixed to the card portion.” Applicant directs the Examiner’s attention to Figures 3-6 and column 4, lines 36-39 where the specification states “The SIM card housing 32 is also provided with pips 37 on the supporting surface in the loading region, to prevent the card from moving from the reading position in a longitudinal direction back toward the loading region. Even though the pips 37 prevent the SIM card from moving backward, the pips 37 do not solve the problem of undesirable mechanical stresses applied to the card during insertion or removal of the card. Because the pips 37 do not retract into the card housing the rear end of the card must be lifted to clear the protrusion of the pips 37 while inserting or removing the card. The lifting of the rear portion of the card causes the card to deflect thereby creating undesirable mechanical stresses to the card. Applicant therefore contends that Haffenden does not teach all the limitations of amended claims 1 and 11 and more specifically Haffenden does not teach “a

housing-side stopper formed by a resilient piece having an end fixed to the card portion.”

Applicant notes that claims 2-3, and 5-10 depend either directly or indirectly from amended claim 1 and therefore the above arguments equally apply to these claims and are herein incorporated by reference.


In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34108.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 19, 2004